The 'reformation' of Henry V is overstated in the final stages, with its glossy 'plain man' act. Hunt reckons that the private lives of Henry and Katherine will go far beyond the `commodification' of his 'capital demand'. Perhaps.

Still, the vast number of allusions that state or imply religious connections invites a wide variety of doctrinal responses. The conclusion is that Shakespeare integrates Protestant and Catholic motifs and systems of thought, cueing in to Elizabethan and Jacobean debates over the nature of spiritual reformation, the efficacy of merit for redemption, and the operation of Providence. All these debates feed in to the dramatist's purposes. The allusions are tiny pellets of meaning, released into the play's bloodstream.

This hook can he recommended for its strong coverage of the religious and doctrinal disputes of the age, which figure even in *Twelfth Night.* Malvolio is part of 'Shakespeare's satire of certain stereotvpes of Puritan behaviour' (p. 84). It is good to he reminded that a 'Brownist' was an extreme Puritan. *Plus at change.*

RALPH BERRY *Stratford-upon-Avon*

doi:10.1093/res/hgi009

MACDONALD P. JACKSON. Defining Shakespeare:
Pericles as Test Case. Pp. xiv+250. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. *£50.*

Professor Jackson has produced an extremely important and truly excellent book, a milestone in so-called 'attribution studies', which aim to identify the writers of texts, or portions of texts, of which the authorship is unknown or a matter of serious dispute. He clearly, and to my mind irrefutably, clinches the case for the belief that George Wilkins, collaborating with Shakespeare, wrote the first two acts of *Pericles,* and he shows that there is a high degree of probability that Wilkins also contributed to the writing of IV ii and, more substantially, IV. vi.

But ultimately the value of this study quite exceeds the case of *Pericles:* Jackson eminently, and with probably unique knowledge, demonstrates the value of a wide range of sound methods which are applicable in attribution studies. Several of these found their origin in the nineteenth century and have too often been contemptuously or ignorantly disregarded or rejected, while the twentieth century has very materially improved upon those earlier procedures and added others of its own. At the end of his book (in chapter 7) Jackson applies a new technique which in thoroughness of scholarly procedure combined with impressive use of 'the new technology' (my quotation marks) appears to be certainly more efficient, and probably yet more accurate, than anything we have seen so far. Anyone seriously interested in studies of authorship, therefore, ought to know this book and will be in its debt, and it should at long last persuade those sceptics who are usually far too ready to dismiss this kind of study without really familiarizing themselves with the issues or with producing adequate alternative approaches. Nor is the significance of the book confined to study of the English Renaissance, although that period is its target.

The question may be asked: does it really matter to know whether something is by Shakespeare, or Wilkins, or anyone else? To most of us, I agree with Jackson, it does, and quite profoundly so. Despite much current nonsense about the death of the author and the supposed cultural conditioning which 'determines' everything, it at the least remains the case that, as Jackson says, 'the various cultural determinants are mediated by an individual playwright's unique brain, and that makes all the difference' (p. 13). One may add that Jackson's research actually *shows* the huge extent, and much of the nature, of the differences between these two Renaissance dramatists. And he does *not* do this only in a scientific manner. In chapter 5, Jackson presents himself as a literary critic and

perceptively characterizes stylistic differences between the two authors without resorting to statistics or categorizations. His short essay on Shakespeare captures strikingly some of the most salient aspects of Shakespeare's art, and he is also informative in his longer discussion of Wilkins's writing. Here, Jackson's reaction to the stylistic expression of both authors is not dissimilar to that of many people, myself included, who have found this a baffling play, and who have felt very ill at ease with the thought that Acts I and II were by Shakespeare.

As Jackson reminds us, Jonathan Bate observed how as a teenager he noticed that `something wasn't quite right about the language of the first two acts', but when the storm broke at the beginning of Act III 'suddenly the verse was humming, and I knew I was reading Shakespeare' (quoted p. 149). Similarly another fine scholar, Sidney Thomas, described the writing in Acts I and II as 'incompetent, flat in diction, lifeless in rhythm, and unconvincing in content' (quoted pp. 30-1). Jackson is more positive in his assessment of Wilkins's contribution when he says that it 'augments his meagre literary and dramatic output: he was part-author of a masterpiece' (p. 9). Exceptionally, I do not in this instance quite agree: to me, the fact that I now know for sure that Acts I and II are written by a mediocre writer explains why I have so much trouble enjoying what comes before Act III. And I do wish to know just what Shakespeare did or did not write, even allowing for the collaborative nature of this and several other Renaissance plays, because I am interested in the output and development of this particular author, given his exceptional quality

It may be useful, in order to provide a specific indication of the methods of attribution studies, to consider some material on prosody in Jackson's book, not least because it is for one thing the fact that Wilkins's verse does *not* hum which sets him apart from Shakespeare. And another reason for drawing attention to this matter is that, as Jackson points out, the study of prosody is today deeply, and damagingly, 'unfashionable' (p. 59).

Yet in times past it was well understood that the quality of verse greatly depends on the poet's prosodic skill. Karl Wentersdorf, for example, in 1951 published an important article which Jackson discusses, in which 'he calculated for each Shakespeare play a single metrical index from the average of the percentages for four features used with something approaching a gradually increasing frequency: extra syllables (feminine endings, alexandrines, and extra mid-line syllables), overflows (with extreme overflows, or weak and light endings, added to the more general total, and so given extra weight by being counted twice), unsplit lines with pauses, and split lines' (p. 62). This method (examined and amplified by Jackson) by itself places Acts III-V of *Pericles* firmly in the company of Shakespeare's later plays, whereas Acts I and II would end up with early plays such as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona.*

Of course, other tests isolate Wilkins, not the youthful Shakespeare, as the author of Acts I and II, but that is why people like Jackson do, indeed, examine many aspects of stylistic/linguistic usage; Wentersdorf's findings make just one contribution to the final result. One way in which Jackson himself identifies Wilkins prosodically is by observing that in early Shakespeare plays combinations such as 'we are', ‘they are', etc. are almost always metrically disyllabic, whereas in Acts I and II of *Pericles* they are most frequently monosyllabic (ch. 3.11, pp. 71-2) . But he takes the question of Wilkins's prosody much further in chapter 4.3, in which it becomes clear that *Pericles* prosodically shares much with Wilkins's play *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage: 'Miseries* and *Pericles,* 1-- 2, are broadly similar in their use of a large amount of rhyme, a predominantly end-stopped verse, a moderate proportion of feminine endings, few alexandrines, and more short lines than would normally he associated with such verse' (p. 86).

The book is so closely packed with a multitude of significant and detailed findings that it is hardly possible to do proper justice to the weight of Jackson's evidence in a brief

review, but I have no doubt that other readers will find themselves as impressed with this fine study as I am.

JOOST DAALDER *Flinders University*

cloi:10.1093fres(hgi012

N. E BLAKE. A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language. Pp. xvi+406. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001. Paper, *L15*.99.

`Although progress in Shakespearian scholarship has made great strides on many fronts, language has not been one of the beneficiaries of these advances' (p. 328). The justice of N. F. Blake's observation is proved by the fact that his own hook is the first substantial attempt to replace the standard authority, E. A. Abbott's A *Shakespearian Grammar: An attempt to illustrate some of the differences between Elizabethan and modern English,* published in 1870 and reaching its third edition that year. One hundred and thirty years is indeed a long time to wait, especially since Abbott's hook, as Blake fairly comments, `is partly a collection of the infelicities and misty es in Elizabethan English rather than a comprehensive grammar' (p. **10).** Wilhelm Franz produced a larger and more systematic treatise in German in 1898-9, reaching a third edition as *Shakespeare-Grammatik* (1924), but it never achieved wide circulation in the English-speaking world. Professor Blake has undoubtedly succeeded in displacing Abbott's work, and his treatise can be welcomed as a thorough and well-organized account which throws fresh light on many aspects of Shakespeare's language.

The core of the book consists of five chapters, discussing 'The Noun Group' (fifty-three pages), 'The Verb Group' (sixty pages), `Adverbials, Interjections, Conjunctions and Prepositions' (fifty-two pages), `Concord, Negation, Ellipsis and Repetition' (thirty-two pages), and 'Clause Organisation and Sentence Structure' (thirty-eight pages). They are prefixed by an introductory chapter on 'The Linguistic Background' (eighteen pages) which treats the complexities of punctuation too briefly (pp. 22-33), and fails to consider the extent to which authorial punctuation was affected by the intervention of scribes, compositors, and whoever edited the First Folio. This is all the more disappointing in that in his main text Blake valuably chronicles clear differences between linguistic usages in the quarto and Folio texts, pointing to sporadic attempts at revising the earlier texts in the light of a rapidly changing language (pp. 46-7, 160-1, 175, 183, 212-13). A thorough study of these linguistic 'updates' would lie welcome. The two last chapters move beyond grammar to more complex linguistic issues: 'Discourse and Register' and 'Pragmatics'.

The main chapters devoted to the traditional grammatical categories define the terms being used, subdivide each category into its appropriate grouping, and illustrate each heading with profuse quotations from Shakespeare, in old spelling. Some expositions of the grammatical categories, lacking examples, are difficult for non-linguists to grasp (e.g. p. 142), but on the whole readers will find a lucid and remarkably sustained labour of discrimination and attention to detail. For instance, recognizing that prepositions have such a wide variety of meanings that they cannot he grouped into 'discrete categories', Blake provides an alphabetical list of fifty-six prepositions as used by Shakespeare (pp. 180 99), in several cases distinguishing multiple applications (fourteen categories for 'for', thirteen for 'to', twelve for 'with', ten for 'of'). Among many helpful discussions one might pick out those on *thou and you* as social markers negotiating shifting relationships (Pp. 56-8), on adjectival compounds (pp. 69 70), on modal auxiliaries (pp. 122 31), on the gerund (pp. *132* 3), on adverbs of place and manner (pp. 157 60), on discourse markers (pp. 29(1 8), and on sentence structure (pp. 302 39). Blake provides a most useful discussion